

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,334	11/02/1999	RONALD A. GUIDOTTI	98-2069	9910
23413	7590 02/12/2004		EXAM	INER
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP			MAPLES, JOHN S	
55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1745	
			DATE MAILED: 02/12/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ______.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4) 🗀	Interview Summary (PTO-413)
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date
5) 🔲	Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____.

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/432,334

Art Unit: 1745

- 1. Applicant's election of the metal sulfide in Paper No. 080103 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 21, 24, 27, 28, 45, 46, 48-51, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the disulfide active material, does not reasonably provide enablement for the sulfide active material. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. (New Rejection)

The present specification and all of the examples set forth disulfide compounds used as the active material in the present electrode. There is no support in the specification for the sulfide compounds-the monosulfides. Thus the claims should be amended to recite the disulfide compounds as the active material in the claimed electrode.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 09/432,334

Art Unit: 1745

5. Claims 45-48 and 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Muffoletto et al.-US 5,716,422 (Muffoletto). (New rejection with regard to claims 50-53)

Reference is made to claims 1 and 7 in the patent to Muffoletto. It is inherent that with the thickness of the active material being 0.001 inch (25 microns) that the particle size would be within the microstructured size range as claimed in claims 48 and 53.

Applicant's arguments have all been considered but are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant argues that Muffoletto does not teach a source of elemental sulfur and a metal sulfide, a source of elemental selenium and a metal selenide or a source of elemental telluride and a metal tellurium. As argued by applicant on pages 4-5 of the January 17, 2003 Remarks, only a trace of the elemental sulfur is present in the final claimed product. Thus this material is not required to be present in the electrode of the applied reference. Thus Muffoletto does not require the presence of the elemental sulfur in the final product and hence the claimed subject matter is met by the teachings of Muffoletto.

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Application/Control Number: 09/432,334

Art Unit: 1745

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muffoletto in view of Gay. (New rejection with regard to claim 54)

Muffoletto teaches all of the claimed subject matter except for the nanostructured iron sulfide. Gay discloses a nanostructured iron sulfide in Example 1 of this patent. To utilize in the teachings of Muffoletto the 15 nanometer particle size of Gay would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to that the active material would have been packed more tightly and would have produced a greater power output.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Gay does not supply the element of the percentage of active material in the layer of claims 21, 41 and 45. This argument is deemed moot because the examiner has not rejected these particular claims over the combination of Muffoletto in view of Gay.

Applicant further argues that claims 28, 48 and 44 are allowable because these claims depend on allowable independent claims. It is noted that claims 28 and 48 have not been rejected over the combination of Muffoletto and Gay and thus this argument is moot. In addition claim 44 is dependent on an allowed claim as applicant has stated and so this claim is allowed over the prior art of record.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Maples whose telephone number is 571-272-1287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:15-3:45.

Art Unit: 1745

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John S. Maples Primary Examiner Art Unit 1745

JSM/2-9-2004